

1 TERRY T. JOHNSON, State Bar No. 121569 (tjohnson@wsgr.com)
2 BORIS FELDMAN, State Bar No. 128838 (boris.feldman@wsgr.com)
3 BAHRAM SEYEDIN-NOOR, State Bar No. 203224 (bnoor@wsgr.com)
4 CHERYL W. FOUNG, State Bar No. 108868 (cfoung@wsgr.com)
5 BRYAN J. KETROSER, State Bar No 239105 (bketroser@wsgr.com)
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
650 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1050
Telephone: (650) 493-9300
Facsimile: (650) 565-5100

0 Attorneys for Defendants
7 UTSTARCOM, INC., HONG LIANG LU,
8 YING WU, MICHAEL SOPHIE, THOMAS TOY,
and FRANCIS BARTON

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PETER RUDOLPH, individually and on behalf) CASE NO.: C-07-4578 SI
of all others similarly situated,)
13)
14 Plaintiff,) DEFENDANTS' REQUEST FOR
15 v.) JUDICIAL NOTICE IN SUPPORT
16 UTSTARCOM, HONG LIANG LU, YING WU,) OF MOTION TO DISMISS
MICHAEL SOPHIE, THOMAS TOY, and) PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED CLASS
FRANCIS BARTON,) ACTION COMPLAINT
17)
18 Defendants.) Date: April 4, 2008
19) Time: 9:00 p.m.
Before: Hon. Susan Illston

1 Defendant UTStarcom, Inc. (“UTSI” or the “Company”) and Defendants Hong Liang Lu,
 2 Ying Wu, Michael Sophie, Thomas Toy, and Francis Barton (the “Individual Defendants”)
 3 hereby request that the Court take judicial notice pursuant to Rule 201 of the Federal Rules of
 4 Evidence of certain documents attached to the accompanying Declaration of Bryan J. Ketroser in
 5 Support of Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff’s Amended Class Action Complaint (the
 6 “Ketroser Declaration”), for the reasons set forth below.

7 **A. Article, Stock Prices and Press Releases: Incorporated by Reference,
 8 Integral to the Amended Complaint, Capable of Accurate and Ready
 Determination, and Matters of Public Record**

9 The *Forbes.com* article, Company stock prices, and November 7, 2006 and July 24, 2007
 10 press releases are all properly subject to judicial notice. To begin with, all four are referred to
 11 and/or quoted in the Amended Complaint. *See* AC ¶ 114 (referencing *Forbes.com* article); *id.* ¶¶
 12 4, 61, 113, 117, 145, 147-48 (referencing Company’s stock price on particular days during the
 13 class period); *id.* ¶¶ 11, 113-14, 146-47 (referencing November 7, 2006 press release); *id.* ¶¶ 19,
 14 116, 148 (referencing and quoting July 24, 2007 press release). Because these documents have
 15 been incorporated by reference into the Amended Complaint, they are judicially noticeable. *See*,
 16 *e.g.*, *In re Silicon Graphics Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 183 F.3d 970, 986 (9th Cir. 1999) (the “incorporation
 17 by reference doctrine” allows the court to take judicial notice of documents ““whose contents are
 18 alleged in a complaint and whose authenticity no party questions, but which are not physically
 19 attached to the [plaintiff’s] pleading””) (citation omitted).¹ Numerous courts have also explicitly
 20 ruled that a company’s stock price during the class period is a fact appropriate for judicial notice.
 21 *See, e.g.*, *In re Finisar Corp. Derivative Litig.*, No. C-06-07660, 2008 WL 131867, at *7 n.4
 22 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 11, 2008) (“Finisar’s closing stock price is public information capable of accurate
 23 and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned

24
 25

 26 ¹ *See also In re Copper Mountain Sec. Litig.*, 311 F. Supp. 2d 857, 863-64 (N.D. Cal. 2004)
 27 (taking judicial notice of press releases because “such press releases are proper to consider under
 28 the incorporation by reference doctrine”); *Plevy v. Haggarty*, 38 F. Supp. 2d 816, 820 (C.D. Cal.
 29 taking judicial notice of, *inter alia*, press releases, analysts’ reports, news articles, and
 30 stock prices, all of which were “cited, quoted from, and/or referenced in” the Amended
 31 Complaint).

1 and are the proper subject of judicial notice in a motion to dismiss.”) (internal quotation
 2 omitted).²

3 Accordingly, Defendants request that the Court take judicial notice of the following:

4 1. A true and correct copy of UTSI’s press release entitled “UTStarcom Announces
 5 Voluntary Review of Equity Grants,” dated November 7, 2006, and attached to the Ketroser
 6 Declaration as Exhibit A.

7 2. A true and correct copy of a *Forbes.com* article entitled “Options Probe Derails
 8 UTStarcom Stock,” dated November 8, 2006, and attached to the Ketroser Declaration as Exhibit
 9 B.

10 3. A true and correct copy of the UTSI’s stock prices from September 4, 2002
 11 through July 24, 2007, attached to the Ketroser Declaration as Exhibit C.

12 4. A true and correct copy of UTSI’s press release entitled “UTStarcom Provides
 13 Select Preliminary Balance Sheet Liquidity Information as of June 30, 2007,” dated July 24,
 14 2007, and attached to the Ketroser Declaration as Exhibit D.

15 **B. SEC Filings: Incorporated by Reference, Integral to the Amended
 16 Complaint, and Filed with the SEC**

17 The SEC filings are also properly subject to judicial notice. Plaintiff explicitly references
 18 and quotes from the Form 10-Q filed by the Company on October 10, 2007—with its
 19 corresponding restatement of prior financials—throughout his Amended Complaint. *See id.* ¶¶
 20 9, 56, 72, 77, 79, 81, 83, 87, 89, 91, 93, 97, 99, 101, 103, 107, 109, 111, 118, 129, 134. The
 21 Amended Complaint also repeatedly references the Company’s class period proxy statements.
 22 *See id.* ¶¶ 66, 112, 134, 161-68. Finally, the Amended Complaint refers extensively to the
 23 Company’s 2001 Director Stock Option Plan. *See id.* ¶¶ 49-53. As such, the SEC filings are
 24 incorporated by reference into the Amended Complaint, and may be considered on a motion to
 25 dismiss. *See Section A, supra.* Since Plaintiff’s § 14(a) claim depends on the existence of a

27 ² *See also Ravens v. Iftikar*, 174 F.R.D. 652, 660-61 (N.D. Cal. 1997) (taking judicial notice
 28 of company’s stock price during class period); *In re Hansen Natural Corp. Sec. Litig.*, 527 F.
 Supp. 2d 1142, 2007 WL 3244646, at *4 n.2 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 16, 2007) (same).

1 false or misleading statement or omission in a proxy, the Company's proxy statements are also
2 "documents on which allegations in the [Amended Complaint] necessarily rely," and would thus
3 be judicially noticeable even if they were not referenced therein. *In re Calpine Corp. Sec. Litig.*,
4 288 F. Supp. 2d 1054, 1076 (N.D. Cal. 2003). Finally, the Court may take judicial notice of the
5 Form 10-Q, proxy statements and attachments as documents that are "public records required by
6 the SEC to be filed." *Plevy v. Haggarty*, 38 F. Supp. 2d 816, 821 (C.D. Cal. 1998); *see also In re*
7 *Copper Mountain Sec. Litig.*, 311 F. Supp. 2d, 857, 863 (N.D. Cal. 2004) (taking judicial notice
8 of SEC filings).

9 Accordingly, Defendants request that the Court take judicial notice of the following:

10 5. A true and correct copy of an excerpt from UTSI's Form 10-Q filed with the SEC
11 on October 10, 2007, attached to the Ketroser Declaration as Exhibit E.

12 6. A true and correct copy of excerpts from UTSI's Form S-3/A filed with the SEC
13 on June 21, 2001, attached to the Ketroser Declaration as Exhibit F.

14 7. A true and correct copy of excerpts from UTSI's Forms DEF 14A and DEFA 14A
15 filed with the SEC on April 2, 2003, August 22, 2003, April 7, 2004, April 18, 2005, June 16,
16 2006, and June 21, 2006, attached to the Ketroser Declaration as Exhibit G.

17

18 Dated: February 29, 2007

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
Professional Corporation

20

21 By: /s/ Bryan J. Ketroser
Bryan J. Ketroser

22

Attorneys for Defendants

23

24

25

26

27

28